#### Remarks

### Claim Objections

The Examiner has noted that the claim numbering in the last response (election) was not in accordance with 37 CRF 1.126. Further, the Examiner has indicated that the claim identified in the last response as "claim 22" has been renumbered as "claim 20", in accordance with a consistent numbering of the claims.

The Applicant, and his below-signed representative, would like to thank the Examiner for addressing this issue without imposing further burden on the Applicant or his representative.

## Rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1, 3, 15, 20, 21, 24 and 25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 1,760,458 ("Weber").

As an initial point, the Applicant notes that claim 8 was included with the listing of claims rejected as being anticipated by Weber (page 3 of Office action, line 9), but was also identified as being allowable on pages 1 and 4 of the Office action. Since the 102 rejection remarks at page 3 did not specifically address the limitations of claim 8 (i.e., "the hanger body is formed of a threaded rod"), the Applicant assumes that the inclusion of claim 8 in the listing of claims rejected under 102(b) at page 3 was erroneous, and that claim 8 is, in fact, allowable. The Applicant will proceed on this assumption, although, as will become apparent, the grounds for allowability of claim 8 will ultimately rest on other grounds.

With respect to claims 1, 21 and 24 (all independent claims), those claims have each been amended to include the limitation that, "the second mounting member is comprised of a swivel arm support rotatably mounted to the hanger body by way of a receptacle affixed to the hanger body". This limitation was taken verbatim from claim 17, which originally depended directly from claim 1 (and is now cancelled). In the Office

S/N: 10/619,209 Case BA02-P01 Amendment "B" action, the Examiner indicated that claim 17 was allowable. Accordingly, since the limitation which rendered claim 17 allowable has now been added to independent claims 1, 21 and 24, those claims should likewise be allowable. Since any claim which depends from an allowable base claim is axiomatically allowable, it follows that claims 2-16, 18-20, 22-23 and 25 are also allowable (as each of them ultimately depend, either directly or indirectly, from either claim 1, 21 or 24).

The Applicant therefore requests that the rejection of claims 1, 3, 15, 20, 21, 24 and 25 as being anticipated by Weber be removed and the claims allowed.

#### Rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 6, 7 and 23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Weber in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,303,574 ("Matossian et al.").

Claims 6 and 7 depend from claim 1; claim 23 depends from claim 21. As argued above, claims 1 and 21 are allowable. It is axiomatic that any claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Accordingly, claims 6, 7 and 23 are allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1 and 21 are allowable. The Applicant therefore requests that the rejection of claims 6, 7 and 21 as being obvious over Weber in view of Matossian et al. removed and the claims allowed.

#### Request for Extension Of Time Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)

The Applicant hereby requests a one (1) month extension of time, under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), to respond to the current Office action, to and through April 15, 2005. The required fee is enclosed herewith.

(Continued on next page.)

# **Summary**

The Applicant believes that this response constitutes a full and complete response to the Office action, and therefore requests timely allowance of claims 1, 3, 5-8, 13-20, 21, 23-25.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the below-signed representative if the Examiner believes this will facilitate prosecution toward allowance of the claims.

Date: April 04, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

Dan R. BACHMAN

John S. Reid

Attorney and agent for Applicant

Reg. No. 36,369

Phone: (509) 534-5789